

Serial No. 10/754,061

July 5, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005

Page 8 of 12

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-10 and 22-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND claims 7 and 22-24.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The Examiner alleged, "claims 7-10, 22, and 30, recite means plus function type language however the specification fails to provide a basis or example for the claimed means thereby making it impossible to determine what would fall within the range of equivalent means."

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants refer the Examiner to the Summary of the Invention section of the originally filed Specification where the Specification provides an example for each of the means used in the claims. For example, on page 3 of the originally filed Specification, the feature of "first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" recited in claim 7 is referred to by reference numbers **S102** and **S104**, which one of ordinary skill in the art would understand to be algorithms based in the memory of a computer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

The Examiner alleged, "[I]t is unclear what the applicant intends to encompass with the presented 'means' language as presented in their claims. This issue is further compounded when the specification as filed fails to draw any light on the claimed means and seems only to recite language similar to the presented claim language."

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As argued above, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the structure for performing the function of the means

Serial No. 10/754,061

July 5, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005

Page 9 of 12

limitations recited in claims 7-10 and 22-30 based upon, for example, the teachings contained in the Summary of the Invention section of the originally filed Specification.

Applicants have amended claims 7 and 22-24 to provide antecedent basis for the features noted by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 7, the Examiner indicated that separate instances of "the coordinates," two on line 11 and one in line 15, lacked antecedent basis. However, Applicants' claim 7 only recites one instance of "the coordinates." Thus, Applicants only amended the only instance of "the coordinates."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner alleged that the present invention fails to (1) be within the technological arts and (2) produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to Technological Arts Analysis, the Examiner stated, "It should however be noted that the remaining claims employ an information storage medium readable by computer and hence employ technology."

The Examiner has rejected all outstanding claims 7-10 and 22-30 in this § 101 rejection. Thus, Applicants are unsure as to what "remaining claims" the Examiner is referring to. However, Applicants believe that the Examiner is referring to Applicants' claims 22-30 because Applicants' claim 22 recites the feature of "execution of an application software stored in memory."

Thus, Applicants believe that the Examiner inadvertently indicated that claims 22-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the means recited in Applicants' claim 7 employ "information storage medium readable by computer" to the same extent that claims 22-30 employ "information storage medium readable by computer" based, for example, upon the teachings in the Summary of Invention section of the originally filed Specification.

Serial No. 10/754,061

July 5, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005

Page 10 of 12

With respect to the Useful, Concrete, and Tangible Analysis, the Examiner alleged, "there is no recitation of the screen picture being displayed on an actual screen in claims 7-10."

While Applicants disagree with the Examiner based upon the last paragraph on page 22 of the originally filed Specification, Applicants have amended claim 7 to recite the feature of "perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture on a display by transforming the coordinates of each object including said cursor object within view of a viewpoint located in said three-dimensional virtual space" in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aoshima et al. (U.S. 6,241,524). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 7-10 and 22-30.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

"A game device for proceeding a game by placing game objects related to the game in a three-dimensional virtual space and by controlling said objects, comprising:

**first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;**

**second game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;**

**cursor object forming means for forming a cursor object indicating a certain area of one of said first and second game fields as well as an area of the other game field corresponding to the certain area; and**

**perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture on a display by transforming coordinates of each object including said cursor object within view of a viewpoint located in said three-dimensional virtual space." (emphasis added)**

Applicants' claim 7 recites the features of "first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" and "second game proceeding means for proceeding the

Serial No. 10/754,061

July 5, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005

Page 11 of 12

game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space." Applicants' claims 22 and 30 recites features which include a first game field and a second game field. That is, Applicants' claims 7, 22, and 30 each recite the features of a first game field and a second game field.

The Examiner has alleged that lines 32-52 of column 5, line 38 of column 7 through line 2 of column 8, and **Figs. 5 and 9** of Aoshima et al. teach these features.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

The game apparatus 10 of Aoshima et al. utilizes only one game field, **NOT two game fields** as recited in Applicants' claims 7 and 22. This is clearly understood by examining, for example, the fifth full paragraph of column 5 and **Figs. 3 and 5** of Aoshima et al. where it teaches that the game of Aoshima et al. involves a competition among tanks that are confined to a single, multi-tiered rectangular field 60. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered the single, multi-tiered rectangular field 60 of Aoshima et al. to teach or suggest the separate and distinct first game field and second game field as recited in Applicants' claims 7 and 22.

Thus, Applicants' respectfully submit that Aoshima et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of "first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" and "second game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" as recited in Applicants' claim 7 and similarly in Applicants' claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aoshima et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claims 7, 22, and 30 of the present application. Claims 8-10 and 23-29 depend upon claims 7 and 22 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 7 and 22 are allowable.

Serial No. 10/754,061  
July 5, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005  
Page 12 of 12

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to July 4, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated March 4, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 5, 2005

  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080